

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WORKING GROUP
REGULAR MEETING

**Held electronically pursuant to a Continuity of Government
Ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 14, 2020.
The meeting will be accessible on public access cable channel TV48or
the County's YouTube channel
(youtube.com/user/jamescitycounty).Citizen comments may be
submitted via US Mail to the Planning Commission Secretary, PO
Box 8784, Williamsburg, VA 23187, via electronic mail to
community.development@jamescitycountyva.gov, or by leaving a
message at 757-253-6750. Comments must be submitted no later than
noon on the day of the meeting. Please provide your name and
address for the public record.**

**May 6, 2020
4:00 P.M.**

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF CALL AND RESOLUTION OF TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES

Mr. Rich Krapf called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

II. CALL TO ORDER

Present:

Jack Haldeman
Rich Krapf
Julia Leverenz
Barbara Null
Tim O'Connor
Frank Polster
Rob Rose
Ginny Wertman

Staff:

Paul Holt, Director of Community Development
Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development

Other:

Vlad Gavrilovic, EPR
Todd Gordon, EPR
Leigh Anne King, Clarion Associates
David Henning, Clarion Associates

**III. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION FOR PLANNING COMMISSION WORKING GROUP
ELECTRONIC MEETING**

Mr. Jack Haldeman made a motion to Adopt the resolution.

The motion passed 8-0.

IV. DISCUSSION OF KEY ISSUES AND QUESTIONS AND QUESTIONS RELATED TO

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Mr. Krapf stated that the purpose of the meeting was to identify important issues that should be addressed in the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Tammy Rosario led the Planning Commission Working Group through a discussion of important issues for different sections of the comprehensive plan and recorded notes which have been included as Attachment #1.

V. OTHER ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Krapf asked if there was any further discussion.

There was none.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Leverenz made a motion to Adjourn. The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. Haldeman adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:40 p.m.

Attachments

1. PCWG Discussion Notes 5/6/2020

1/7 - Environment (4:15-4:30)

1. Watershed Planning (Mr. Polster)

- a. have a robust process and investment in fixing problems already (technical approaches)
- b. also looking for ways to preserve pristine areas of the County using watershed zoning and planning to put limits on impervious surface levels per sub-watershed
- c. will need to have other tools to help accomplish this as well (AFDs, PDRs for preservation, etc.)
- d. make linkage to land use map (reference existing and expected impervious surface levels), followed by approval of Board, incorporation into the Zoning Ordinance
- e. overall, looking for ways to protect pristine/sensitive areas downstream of development
- f. Dr. Rose – there could be other environmental indicators to measure health of ecosystems: deforestation, forest change,

2. Equine Stocking Rate (Mr. Polster)

- a. Consider Zoning Ordinance amendments that reflect recommendations of the Colonial Soil and Water Conservation District

3. Lower Chickahominy Watershed Study (Mr. Polster)

- a. Consider various strategies for preserving this area to the County (6 noted in report)

4. Flooding, sea level rise (Ms. Leverenz)

- a. All of the above (transportation and property impacts and others)
- b. Are there areas where we should be looking and working with property owners to plan for and keep them safe (could include moving uses)?
- c. Dr. Rose – this is a critical issue. Green infrastructure planning could be a really important



PCWG DISCUSSION NOTES 5/6/2020

and beneficial way to mitigate this and to improve overall environmental health and quality

- d. Mr. Polster – some projects are already on the books to help, but this is the first time our CP can really adjust the CP and address this issue directly across sections with respect to transportation infrastructure and safety for neighborhoods,
- e. Mr. O'Connor - Could revisit work that Christy Parrish and others did on floodplains

What guidance do you need from the community on **environment** issues to help inform policy direction?

- Mr. Polster – In preserving the areas of the County exercise, there is a need for education to show that many of them intersect with environmentally sensitive areas, the things the County has done to preserve those areas, and their significance both economically and environmentally. It would go to the funding piece and why this is a value. Lower Chick can be a good case example.
- Ms. Leverenz – Water quality vs. water availability: Wondering how important of an issue this is to the community?
- Mr. Krapf – Any support from the community (insurance liability-wise with respect to sea-level rise) for the County taking a more aggressive stance on restricting commercial or residential development in certain areas or raising taxes to address areas that may be impacted by sea level rise? Would the public be receptive to a broader approach?
- Ms. Wertman - Can we build details on the gap between level of importance/satisfaction on water quality (95% important, 80% satisfaction)?

2/7 - Housing (4:30-4:40)

1. Housing Authority (Mr. Krapf)
 - a. Would JCC benefit from establishing a Housing Authority (Williamsburg has one) to manage the workforce/affordable housing issue? What would be involved? Would it solve a problem? What allowed Williamsburg to do it?
 - b. Does this concept lend itself to public-private partnership with JCC owning the properties and providing maintenance services? Does it put the County in a landlord position? Does the County have the staff for any responsibilities?
2. County-wide overlay(s) to target land conservation and affordable housing sites (Ms. Leverenz)
 - a. Take a stab in the land use section of doing an overlay, identifying those areas where it make the most sense for affordable housing given proximity to public transportation, etc.
3. County should do work necessary to establish policies recommended by the WHTF report and incorporate into CP (Ms. Wertman)
 - a. Examples: mobile home parks, use of County land, voluntary inclusionary zoning, housing trust fund, accessory dwelling units
4. Are we going to have a HOP and what would be the details? (Mr. Polster)

What guidance do you need from the community on [housing](#) issues to help inform policy direction?

1. Mr. O'Connor – whether people would be supportive of development applications that are 100% devoted to such units or would there be preference for more mixed income/mixed cost units?
2. Mr. Haldeman - Would people be willing to spend some/more locality funds (if any) or to reallocate existing funding to address this issue?
3. Mr. Leverenz - Would people prefer to have the affordable units (moderate to high density) ear low density neighborhoods? (NIMBY)

3/7 – Economic Development (4:40-4:50)

1. Public-Private Partnerships (Mr. Krapf)
 - a. Could the County take a broader or more pro-active approach on potential projects that might have substantial public benefit (such as revitalization of Toano) that might be on properties other than those that are on County land?
 - b. Should there be weighting and scoring criteria - much like we use for CIP - to identify projects or geographic areas that could benefit the project and the County in such a partnership?
 - c. If so, should the Office of Economic Development spearhead an effort to assist the developer and bring economic resources and potential investors to the table?
 - d. What are best practices in other jurisdictions in Virginia or nationally where this concept works?
 - e. Good examples and research out there on best practices
2. Through EDA or County, consider creating a restaurant district, with shops, that could provide park and walk opportunities (such as from library, waterways) could be ideal for restaurants and other ventures that lend themselves to these types of partnerships, like Jamestown Beach. (Mr. O'Connor) Good idea to research best practices and explore models to adopt like enterprise zones that could be applied on a County-wide basis with incentives. (Mr. Krapf)
3. Make linkage to BCTF report criteria throughout any discussion on jobs and types of businesses we'd like to attract. (Mr. Haldeman)
 - a. Sync up with EDA and OED's targeted sector study and desired job generation (Mr. Holt)
 - b. Agree on definition of what we mean by attracting new jobs and new businesses with more specificity (Mr. Haldeman)

- c. Talk about education and importance of technical education and other opportunities (noting lack of them nearby) and make more concrete references in our GSAs
- 4. ED goal needs reworking (Mr. Haldeman)
- 5. Need to think through the dramatic changes in the retail industry and impact as a mainstay to our economy. (Mr. Haldeman)
- 6. Need to consider the impacts to businesses with the planned increases in the minimum wage (outsourcing labor, increased use on technology). (Mr. Haldeman)

What guidance do you need from the community on **economic development issues to help inform policy direction?**

- Dr. Rose – What does the community support as far as priorities for ED? (ED means different things to different people.)
- Mr. Haldeman – How do we find out what parts of our CP are at odds with citizen wishes (e.g., Ironbound, Oakland development apps)?
- Mr. Krapf - What other types of new revenue stream from an ED standpoint would be welcome here in the County? How would they prefer staff go about developing that (perhaps technology parks) to foster/ promote revenue streams that less reactive to economic downturns?

4/7 – Community Character (4:50-5:00)

1. Scenic easements along CCCs or roads with exceptional viewsheds – purchase of development rights vs. legislated setbacks. Pluses? Pitfalls? Costs? Other localities' experiences? (Mr. Krapf)
2. Forge Road (and other rural views like Croaker Rd.) (Mr. O'Connor)
 - a. Cluster overlay or other long-term plan to protect those views are needed (solar farms could intrude on the viewsheds)
 - b. What do we want to protect - views or rural lands – and employ a strategy to protect that
 - c. Better defined rural lands
3. Other open space/PDR issues (Mr. O'Connor)
 - a. If that is the direction of the county, eligible parcels should be better defined
 - b. Parcels outside PSA and are limited by topography or zoning and are not in danger of being developed should not qualify
 - c. Must have rigorous guidelines, require tangible or measurable public benefit (Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Krapf)
 - d. Public hearings might need to be required for PDR applications (Mr. O'Connor, Ms. Leverenz)
4. Land conservation tools - clarify distinctions, duplication/overlap, costs, benefits in one place versus another, define a target/overlay area and tools (Ms. Leverenz)
5. What is our community character? How can it be defined by the community and then be addressed in each section of the plan? Look at how they interact rather than being separate issues. (Dr. Rose)
6. Lower Chickahominy Study was a good example to gauge whether that was an area where people want preservation and what strategies to employ. (Mr. Polster)
 - a. Programs should be connected and strategically employed.

What guidance do you need from the community on **community character** issues to help inform policy direction?

- Would the citizens be willing to pay more in taxes, allocate resources differently, or support a bond referendum to preserve land? (Ms. Leverenz)
- What exactly do people want to preserve (viewsheds, land, etc.)? (Mr. O'Connor)
- Efforts to preserve rural lands was a big gap area (Ms. Wertman)
 - How much do people know regarding what's been done?
 - How accurate are the survey results?
 - What are the details about the gap? What more do they want done?

5/7 – Transportation (5:00-5:10)

1. Sea-level rise and flooding (Mr. Polster)
 - a. Examples: Colonial Parkway, Jamestown area local roads, Jamestown Rd over Powhatan Creek, roads in Governor's Land
2. Urban Development Areas (Mr. Polster)
 - a. Hear a bit more about each of the 11 areas and their relationship to Hazelwood and Anderson Corner EO areas
 - b. Also the relationship to modeling
3. Rochambeau Rd. from Croaker Rd. to Clover Leaf Lane (Mr. Polster)
 - a. Hear more discussion on improving this segment as it has become an alternative route b/t I-64 and Rt. 60
 - b. It's narrow and dangerous and should be fixed
 - c. Have we shot ourselves in the foot by closing off an alternative (Mooretown Rd Ext) with recent solar farm development app? (Mr. O'Connor)
4. General congestion problems on Route 60 and Monticello that are not really fixable through transportation solutions. What land use mitigation strategies are needed to address them? (Mr. Haldeman)
5. Emphasize connectivity, alternate transportation modes (Ms. Leverenz)
6. We hear about bike lanes trend toward walkability, compact communities with sidewalks. Will that be popular here given our age demographics and the projections and our housing development issues? (Ms. Wertman)
7. Do we need to plan for electric and autonomous cars? (Ms. Leverenz)

What guidance do you need from the community on [transportation](#) issues to help inform policy direction?

- Helpful to know where people anecdotally find the bottle-necks (Mr. O'Connor)
- What are people thinking about in terms of walkability and public transportation and where improvements can be made? (Dr. Rose)
- Will people want golf carts, scooters, and electric recharging station in parking lots? (Ms. Leverenz)

6/7 – Land Use (5:10-5:20)

1. Mooretown Rd./Hill Pleasant Farm (Mr. Polster)
 - a. Re-examine the appropriateness of EO designation
 - b. Incorporate this into the modeling
 - c. LOS was not improved on surrounding roads with Mooretown Rd extension. Bigger impact from reduction of development.
 - d. Building the extension would exacerbate traffic problems – take out full connection or at least portion that goes to Rochambeau (Mr. Haldeman)
2. Either extend utilities to serve designated Economic Opportunity zones, or only have EO inside PSA (Ms. Leverenz)
3. Economic Opportunity Zone (Mr. O'Connor)
 - a. Density
 - b. Increased residential opportunity consistent with Smart City Design concepts
 - c. Increased vertical for more cost efficient construction and create additional affordable housing opportunities
 - d. Remove certain uses (residential and childcare, refer to recording for additional ones) from the zoning/ lu designation for the Barhamsville interchange to maximize its value (best for offices and light industry but not other uses that will just create traffic (Mr. Haldeman)
 - e. For Barhamsville and Anderson's Corner Area, have models show them as MCR and MCI to see the different (Mr. Polster).
 - f. Eliminating housing from these areas could have negative effect on road network as it would eliminate walk to work (Mr. O'Connor)



PCWG DISCUSSION NOTES 5/6/2020

4. Incentive for sustainability/modern technology driven construction (Mr. O'Connor)
 - a. energy
 - b. material
 - c. most sustainability in modern construction has a greater impacts on regional level vs. local level
5. Short-term rentals (Mr. O'Connor)
 - a. What role do they play in our local economy?
 - b. Should there be limit to number or locations?
 - c. What is public benefit - i.e. creation of jobs with benefits, support of sports or agritourism?
6. Expiration dates on tourist home SUPs; review tourist home standards (Ms. Leverenz)
7. Ft. Eustis military overlay district (Ms. Leverenz)
8. Promote workforce housing and economic opportunities (such as grocery store) in the general industry land use area of Grove through land use changes (Mr. Haldeman)
9. What is the deliverable in our consultant contract on the PSA, whether to expand it or keep it as is? (Mr. Polster)

What guidance do you need from the community on **land use issues to help inform policy direction?**

- On HPF and Mooretown Road, what do they think about keeping it rural and outside PSA versus developing it? (Mr. Polster)
- Is the community supportive of the County extending utilities to Barhamsville interchange properties to prepare it for economic opportunity (appropriate to be in PSA, appropriate for County to spend resources to incentivize this and provide affordable housing and a grocery store up there)? (Ms. Leverenz, Mr. Polster)
- Do we know whether the community supports expansion of the PSA? If so, where? (Ms. Wertman)
- What reconsideration of the PSA line should there be based on patterns of development since it was drawn? Adjustments vs. redrawing? (Mr. Krapf) Contraction? (Ms. Wertman)
- What support is there for lowering the density in rural lands? (Ms. Leverenz)
- We need more community preference information on mixed use and mixed density developments. (Ms. Wertman)



PCWG DISCUSSION NOTES 5/6/2020

7/7 – Other topics: Population, Population Needs, Public Facilities, Parks and Rec, Miscellaneous (5:20-5:30)

1. Impact fees vs. proffers, using quantified cumulative impact on infrastructure (Ms. Leverenz)



What guidance do you need from the community on **other topics to help inform policy direction?**

- May be difficult to educate citizens sufficiently, but there could be cost information that can be shared (Ms. Leverenz)